



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,247	10/16/2001	Leon Gurevich	7181	6011

7590 07/03/2003

PAUL M. DENK
763 South New Ballas Rd.
St. Louis, MO 63141

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

UNDERWOOD, DONALD W

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3652

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	091 Examiner <i>Underway</i>	Gurevich et al Art Unit 3652
— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —		
Period for Reply	A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	
<p>- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</p> <p>- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.</p> <p>- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</p> <p>- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).</p> <p>- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
Status	1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04/09/13</u> 2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL. 2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final. 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims	4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-4, 9, 17-27</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>None</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>None</u> is/are allowed. 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-4, 9, 17-27</u> is/are rejected. 7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>None</u> is/are objected to. 8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>None</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers	9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on <u>04/09/13</u> is/are: a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on <u>04/09/13</u> is: a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of: 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. <u>None</u> . 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.	
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.		
Attachment(s)	1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>None</u> 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). <u>None</u> 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Detailed Action

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 2-4, 9 and 17-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 17, this claim appears inaccurate. The phrase "said parts are moved along said slide" in line 15 is inaccurate. Also "said members" in line 11 should be --said at least one structural member-- or --each said structural member--.

Regarding claim 18, the meaning of the phrase "in along" in line 7 is unclear. Clarification is required.

Regarding claim 21, "said rake" lacks a clear antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 22, "said gripper" lacks a clear antecedent basis. Further the gripper and rake should be positively correlated to define an operative device. For example, each needs an actuator and needs to be located to work together.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 2, 9, 17-20 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over newly cited Crockett.

It would have been to use the modular unit in Crockett in any conventional parts processor for assembling, testing and/or packaging parts.

6. Claims 2-4, 9, 17-20 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagai et al in view of newly cited Crockett.

It would have been obvious to substitute cylinder actuators for the actuators in Nagai in view of the teaching in Crockett. This would have been an obvious substitution of equivalents.

Regarding applicants' parts processor, such is met by Nagai.

7. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagai et al in view of newly cited Crockett as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Loock.

It would have been obvious to use plural parts moving structure in Nagai to enhance production in view of the teaching in Loock (elements 6). This structure is synonymous with the rake.

8. Applicants' remarks have been carefully considered but are not deemed persuasive. While Nagai fails to show a cylinder actuator such devices are well known as far back as 1977 as per Crockett. Patentability lies in a system utilizing these actuators in a particular way, i.e., to move a gripper and rack in a specific cooperation and not in the use of cylinder actuator in a modular unit *per se* as set forth in the instant claims.

9. Newly cited Takahashi et al and Schneid disclose cylinder actuators.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to D. Underwood at telephone number (703) 308-1113.

Underwood/kn
June 30, 2003

Donal W. Underwood 6/30/03
DONALD W. UNDERWOOD
PRIMARY EXAMINER